DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 009 CS 502 713

AUTHOR Casmir, Fred L.
TITLE Germany's National Socialism and America's "New Left": A Comparative Study of Two-Neo-Romantic Political Movements and Their Rhetoric.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 29p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Communication Association of the Pacific (Honolulu, HI, July 30-August 1, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Activism: Comparative Analysis: Discourse Analysis: European History: *Modern History: Political Issues: *Political Power: *Rhetoric: *Romanticism: Social Action: Speech Communication: United States History
IDENTIFIERS *National Socialism (Germany): *New Left

ABSTRACT

Neo-Romantic aspects of Hitler's National Socialism Movement in Germany and the New Left movement in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s are detailed in this paper. Following a discussion of fundamental concepts, the paper analyzes the Romantic bases of the two movements, including their use of nonverbal symbols: their views on morality, sexual behavior, and history: their development of mythologies: and their identification with "a cause." The paper then examines the rhetorical strategies of the two movements, specifically, their oversimplification of issues, their calls for faith in the movement and for action, their use of such terms as "power" and "unity," and their personal attacks on a "common enemy." (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180009

GERMANY'S NATIONAL SOCIALISM AND AMERICA'S "NEW LEFT":

A Comparative Study of Two-Neo-Romantic Political Movements and Their Rhetoric

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Presented by:

Fred L. Casmir

Pepperdine University

Seaver College

To The Annual Convention of the Communication Association

Of the Pacific

August, 1979

Honolulu, Hawaii

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Fred L. Casmir

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS502713

Comparisons between Hitler's National Socialism and the American New Left of the 1960's and early 1970's are possible because, among other factors, both of these movements were neo-romantic in their basic approach to the problems of their day.

IDENTIFICATION AND DEFINITIONS OF FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS

For the purposes of this study, any group or individual dedicated to the overthrow of the existing social and political order in the United States, if necessary by violent means, and the replacement of that order by some form of government, structure, or political philosophy related primarily to Communist, Marxist, or Maoist political value-systems will be considered a member of the "New Left." At the same time the "New Left" may have little or no formal, or readily apparent official connection with party organizations, such as the Communist Party USA. A concise, all-inclusive definition is difficult because groups, group-leadership, and group-aims continued in a state of flux, at least as far as clearly discernible aims and purposes were concerned.

Those who may assert that Hitler's National Socialism was a monolithic force which in no way can be compared to the much more loosely structured New Left in America, or its indefinite political doctrines make two mistakes. Hitler's own philosophy was often poorly defined and indefinite in its final form, as can be seen in Mein Kampf and other documents like Hitler's Table Talks. These documents bear the marks of many conflicting and complimentary ideologies which the Fuehrer had heard expressed by various individuals during the confused and threatening days after World War I.[1] Racial supremacy, extreme religious concepts, concepts of communal living, attacks on members of various German "establishments" of the 1920's, such as indus-

trialists and monarchists, all these subjects and many more were bitterly and publicly discussed in the streets, market places, and newspapers of post-World War Germany.[2] There was little about Hitler's political concepts that was uniquely his own, or represented a concise, clearly defined doctrine.

Furthermore, those who consider Hitler's movement to have been a monolithic organization with few or no internal dissensions react more to Nazi propaganda than the facts. Hitler took leadership away from those who had controlled the small "Deutsche Arbeiter Partei" through the use of threats, temper tantrums, and his ability as a speaker.[3] After Hitler had built the party into a relatively meaningful organization, internal struggles went on. Otto and Gregor Strasser, and even Hitler's close associate of later years, Dr. Joseph Goebbels, opposed him and plotted the overthrow of Hitler's faction in the later National Socialist German Workers Party.[4] Not even Hitler's party platform was something which could claim clear development or definition of unique ideas since it was initially built on or around Gottfried Feder's earlier, even more socialistic concepts.[5] Besides Strasser and S.A. leader Captain Franz Pfeffer von Salomon, others who opposed Hitler for cutting short their revolutionary actions, included the Chief of Staff of Hitler's political shock troops, the S.A., Fritz Roehm, and many of his lieutenants. They were killed in a bloody purge after Hitler came to power because they represented a threat to his rule.[6] Rudolf Hess flew to England during World War II in an attempt to bring about a peace treaty with the Allies, much to Hitler's shock.[7] Many of Hitler's officers and civilian officials participated in the abortive plot to kill him in 1944.[8] If one takes the time to consider the internal wranglings and struggles which finally made Martin Borman the power behind Hitler's "throne," the glib description of Hitler-Germany as a highly unified political machine becomes inadequate.[9]

The ill-defined, highly emotional and romanticized political concepts developed in post-war Germany before Hitler's rise, and in America during the 1960's and 1970's, came about for basically the same reasons. Complex economic and political problems, as well as confusing international situations involving the rise of new world powers such as the United States of America, and Soviet Russia created deep fears and discontent in post-World War I Germany. The feelings of insecurity and guilt shared by many citizens of any nation sensing trouble, especially if that trouble is difficult to analyze and specify, seem almost inevitably to lead to the rise of political, religious, and social prophets to whom the people will turn for answers. If problems are easily defined and rectified, logical, cool approaches usually win out. However, the more complex challenges become, the more readily will people, over a period of time, find themselves drawn to leaders who may still not present a solution to the problems, but who somehow stir the imagination and the emotions of their audiences. Such times often are productive of romantic leaders and romantic movements, with highly emotional rather than logical solutions and actions intended to solve problems.

New movements in the Western, and often in other parts of the world, in their attempts to replace existing "establishments" usually have only one power on their side, the spoken word: Since they lack the money and numerical strength, as well as control over the mass media, other forms of communication are usually difficult if not impossible to employ. Secondly, every political movement attempts to formulate specific values and doctrines which represent a means for recruiting followers, encouraging believers, and attacking common enemies, thus providing the rhetorical critic with several specific bases for his studies.

The concept of "romanticism" needs consideration. Common factors which the rhetorical critic would consider can be categorized in the areas

of style, invention, and non-oral supporting symbols. Included are abstract terms, emotional words, references to spiritual, religious or pseudo-religious concepts, frequent use of rhythm and rhym, stylistic devices which are unusual or shocking to the emotions or values of listeners and readers, ill-defined goals often coupled with calls for dedicated action, the public presentation of values sharply differing from those of existing establishments, unusual actions, dress, and behavior. Basically, romantic movements appeal to emotions rather than logic although the appearance of logic may be sought because of prevailing cultural values. Feelings elicited by verbal-stimuli as well as color-, form-, and sound-stimuli are relied on more heavily than factual or scientific data for the purpose of developing unified actions by large groups of people. Values used by the establishment are frequently employed, but re-defined usually being given more abstract, indefinite, emotional and non-functional connotations. There is a heavy reliance on sexual and spiritual imagery in romantic communications. These devices and others have in the past been associated with romantic movements and should be considered in this comparative study in their relationship to the rhetorical strategies of the two movements.[10]

The term "romantic" is frequently used in literature to indicate a movement or form of expression which is distinguished from or seen as the opposite of the "classical" form of expression, in other areas it might be contrasted with such terms as "empiricism." While undoubtedly there are elements of both factors in most literary works, for our purposes we will accept those definitions or descriptions which indicate that the overriding intention of the poet or writer, the "orientation," as it were, of the individual sharing literary works is the primary reason for clarifying an approach as "romantic." Thus the emphasis is on the sender and his intentions, or his

primary interest in interpreting symbolically the individually perceived reality. These forms of expression have some commonly accepted emphases which make at least some specific categorization possible. Remembering that many or almost all of these ideas originate within the literary genre, nevertheless I feel that the use of the term "romantic" can be extended as is done in this paper.

In line with this thinking, and relating to the following discussion, it is interesting to note that Praz indicates that the "essence of "Romanticism consequently comes to consist in that which cannot be described."[11] This factor often leads opponents of romantic movements to attack them because of the "indefiniteness" of their aims, purposes, and forms of expression. On the other hand, as important as the poetic "ecstatic" is to the literary movement, because, "It is romantic to consider concrete expression as a decadence, a contamination.[12] Some ecstatic extremes are noticeable in all romantic movements, but as Praz hastens to add "...these are extreme cases, in which the romantic tends to merge in the mystical. The normal is that of suggestive expression, which evokes much more than it states.[13] Some authors make a somewhat tenuous, but nevertheless thought-provoking transition from poetry to politics, as for instance Bowra, when he writes: "They saw that the power of poetry is strongest when the creative impulse works untrammeled, and they knew that in their own case this happened when they shaped fleeting visions into concrete forms and pursued wild thoughts until they captured and mastered them. Just as in politics men turned their minds from existing order to vast prospects of reformed humanity, so in the arts they abandoned the conventional plan of existence for private adventures which had an inspiring glory.[14] Significantly then, the major task of the political romanticist becomes a type of communication which will first of all

give form to his "fleeting visions," secondly to find significant symbols with which to communicate these more "concrete forms" to various individuals, and finally to shape individual feeling and understanding into some sort of mass movement, or general enough agreement to result in a "reformed humanity." It is the latter task which in many cases has resulted in the destruction of the romantic political movement, because its visions were difficult to match or sustain in the daily world of reality faced by their followers. As the poet, the romantic political leader is "confident not only that the imagination was his most precious possession but that it was somehow concerned with supernatural order."[15] But, as Bowra also points out, in both cases presentation of or sharing of romantic ideas may lead to the "...danger of so bold an assumption...that the poet may be so absorbed in his own private universe and in the exploration of its remoter corners that he may be unable to convey his essential experience to other men and fail to convert them to his special creed.[16] Hitler was more successful than the New Left, primarily because his was a more unified movement speaking with the one voice of its charismatic leader. Bowra, quoting Coleridge's praise of Wordsworth makes the essential points quite well for me:

> It was the union of deep feeling with profound thought, the fine balance of truth in observing with the imaginative faculty in modifying the objects observed; and above all the original gift of spreading the tone, the atmosphere, and with it the depth and height of the ideal world around forms, incidents, and situations, of which, for the common view, custom had bedimmed all the lustre, had dried up the sparkle and the dew drops.[17]

In this one statement in praise of an outstanding example of romanticism, is summed up much of the raison d'etre, the philosophy, the aims, the purposes, and even the methodology of any romantic approach, as defined for this paper. In the following pages I attempt to provide an essential

description of two political achievements and their similarities rather than their dissimilarities, on the basis of their perceived nature as romantic movements. It is significant that romantic movements tend to result in authoritarian structures, exactly because its leaders claim insight, and a relationship to truth based on that personal, non empirically verifiable truth, which requires submission and acceptance rather than discussion, verification, or intellectual understanding.

THE ROMANTIC BASES OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM AND THE NEW LEFT

America's New Left openly embraced Marxist or Maoist concepts, and was openly contemptuous of Nazism and Fascism. This has led many people to consider the two movements to be opposites or unrelated entities which cannot really be compared when it comes to their value systems.

The vital differences between Communism or Marxism and National Socialism from an ideological standpoint, are the insistence of the former on a supposedly scientific evolution of society, and highly developed plans for world-wide domination in keeping with that evolutionary concept. National Socialism lacked such definite plans. While it has been repeatedly stated that Hitler had plans for world-wide conquest, the careful student knows that to be a myth.[18] National Socialism's reliance on the extensive use of romantic symbols, and its insistence on the influence of a higher power, Hitler's "Vorsehung," are much more related to America's New Left than the pseudo-scientific approach of Communism. While some of the ideas expressed by the New Left are undoubtedly Marxist in origin, the way in which they are handled or expressed, the fundamental philosophical approach to them, has been neo-romantic and more related to the basic appeals found in the Nazi movement. My impression and description of America's New Left needs

also to be considered in light of its essential rejection by Russian Marxists who saw it as a dangerous heresy.

Non-verbal symbols:

Most popular- or mass-movements probably incorporate some romantic concepts in their early stages of development. That may be the inevitable result of the indefiniteness of early developmental stages, which nevertheless require some sort of strong unifying ideas. As the development of such movements progresses, and especially as these revolutionary groups turn into the "establishment" after taking over power, romantic notions have to be replaced with pragmatic answers to day-to-day problems. While lip service may continue to be given to the original romantic concepts, they will play less and less of a part in directing efforts, eventually becoming concepts to be attacked by new revolutionary groups because of their supposed betrayal by those former revolutionaries, now turned "establishment."

However, the degree of romanticism involved would seem to differ with various movements. It is here that National Socialism and America's New Left need to be considered in more detail. One area would be the use of non-verbal symbols which form a backdrop or area of support for the total romantic movement.

In the case of Communism, for instance, the hammer and sickle as a primary symbol of the movement, make use of two objects which are considerably more "functional" than either the Nazi's swastika or the New Left's peace symbol. The greater degree of abstraction, lending itself to much greater personal involvement through individualized interpretation, indicates the difference between Communism and the other two movements. Interestingly both the swastika and the peace-symbol take their original forms from old

Germanic runic symbols. No attempt is made here to prove that the choice of such symbols is always conscious or their use clearly defined. As a matter of fact, the emotional appeal of such symbols often is much greater than any logical identification of the meaning of these symbols would warrant. The romantic leader chooses them because they are highly abstract and can be much more readily "loaded" with meaning than more functional symbols.

Obviously, one symbol does not prove the point. However, if one adds unusual, romanticized forms of dress, whether they are the supposedly individualized but in fact rather uniform dress of hippies and many members of the New Left, or the colorful dress uniforms of the Nazi movement (which were both rather non-functional but representative of the value systems expressed by these movements), the picture becomes more complete. Nor should one overlook the fact that hair is another of the romantic symbols used. It is easy to point to the differences between the long hair and beards of the New Left or the Afro-naturals, on one hand, and the short "military-style" haircuts of the Nazis on the other. What must be realized, however, is that in both movements the hairstyle was not primarily a question of functional usefulness but rather of romanticized symbolism. Hair thus was a visual expression of a given value system and opposition to the value systems of others.

Both National Socialists and the New Left relied heavily upon the use of non-verbal symbols which served the same functions for both, namely to further support romantic, ill-defined, nonpragmatic notions through frequently non-functional symbols. In the case of traditional Communism a somewhat higher degree of functional symbolism and less abstract support for the announced value systems seem to exist than for America's New Left.

Morality:

The development of a kind of "new morality" was apparent in both movements. Hitler insisted on his right of retribution against those who were his political opponents, always pointing to the alleged crimes perpetrated by them. Behind it all there always was the principle of the "moral right." "Our enemy fears the retribution for the overwhelming number of crimes which he has perpetrated on our people."[19] America's New Left used a very similar approach to establish the righteousness of its cause, as in the following statement. "Rick Brown, one of the founders and leaders of the Center for Participant Education, the student group that initiated the Cleaver course, charged the Chancellor's action, 'is part of the new campaign of repression against those who have opposed the war and who are attempting the restructuring of their society...'"[20] Association of the enemy with the unpopular Vietnam War was one vital way of associating the political opposition to the New Left with immoral actions. At the same time, the shocking language used by men like Cleaver made responses by more moderate opponents less effective, as in the following example: "I say to all of them (the presidential candidates): There's a storm brewing, and the people are going to say (to the Establishment): 'Up against the wall, mother fuckers. You've done wrong."[21] Like Hitler, Cleaver did not need to always define the specific "wrong" or the "crimes," but the overwhelming note was one of moral disgust. When supplying positive means of identification, again, Cleaver often did not comment on specific doctrines, but used vague, romantic terms such as love and relate. "We have got to get into a frame of mind where we realize that Karl Marx had a whole lot to say about how the society should be run,' he said. 'We have got to be able to say: We love you Mao Tse Tung; we love you Ho Chi Minh,

we love you Fidel Castro. We have got to be able to relate to the dynamics of what's happening in the world today.'"[22]

Just as vague, but certainly as deeply moralistic in tone, was one of Peter Camejo's responses to the treatment Cleaver had received. "Camejo said the censuring of Cleaver 'is admission that they are afraid of what we might find out about them and the world they're trying to mold us to.'"[23] With National Socialism the New Left shared a deep-seated hatred of "them" and the fact that "they" are going to get "us." Both movements had really no desire to define the "enemy" in anything but broad terms, but that enemy was always present behind every threat, and every move the New Left and National Socialism made.

The chant "We shall overcome" had the strong moral tone which made it so appealing to many, as indeed was true of many slogans used by the New Left. Into that category fell the cries of "Hell no, we won't go" when speaking of the Vietnam War, or the call to "Make Love not War," certainly a most romantic answer to the world's problems. Even the idealization of Ho Chi Minh, the man who by others might have been judged as responsible for the Vietnam War as anyone on the American side, (illustrated by the chant "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh") fitted into this category. The rejection on one hand of the symbol of American nationalism, the American flag, while at the same time raising the symbol of another country's nationalism, the North Vietnamese flag, cannot be understood from a logical standpoint, but must be seen as the expression of a basically romantic philosophy creating its own morality for the actions of the New Left. Compare these expressions to the idealistic, romantic chants and songs Nazi Germany heard: "Deutschland, Deutschland ueber alles," "Kraft durch Freude," "Arbeit and Brot," "Deutschland Erwache," and the similarities become even more pronounced.

The struggle for both movements became a moral opposition to others' value systems. Hitler appeared as certain that his interpretation of morality required him to stand up against the common enemy as was true of America's New Left in the 1960's. "And if you say 'You may not go out on the streets--we are going out on the streets anyway.' And if you say 'We are going to beat you'--as many sacrifices as you want to burden us with, this young Germany is going to march again and again, one day it's going to reconquer entirely the German street, the German man."[24] Similar emotional oversimplifications can be found in publications such as the People's Voice which appeared shortly after the Los Angeles Watts riots. It declared "In their memory (the Watt's martyrs) we pledge to destroy U.S. Imperialism." From there it was only a short step to the statement of the Black Panthers: "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."[25] Another example of this "morally based" call for destructive action was the kind of material used repeatedly by Afro-American Revolt, a publication put out in Cuba by Robert Williams. In its May-June, 1964, issue, the front-page cartoon encouraged the readers to "Kill for freedom."[26]

As was true of Nazi Germany, the basic ideology of the New Left required that everyone, including women must take their part. One of the choices of the New Left saw this involvement of Black Americans as follows: "First, as women we are expected to be by our men's sides, gun in hand to help them carry on. Secondly, as women, we MUST reproduce warriors so that there will be future generations to carry on the revolution..."[27] As Hitler felt that an evaluation of peace could only be made from the standpoint of war, some members of the New Left were so convinced of the necessity for a revolution that it became a continuous

process for which generations of "warriors" had to be produced by members of both movements. As a result, violent action, or war as the case of the Nazis, became an inevitable outlet for stored-up frustrations and hate.

Mythology:

In some cases, extremist organizations seeking identity and group norms, developed fairly involved mythologies and belief-systems. These were reminiscent of some of the "Germanic" mythologies, symbol-systems, and religious concepts which the Nazis propagated. One example is the philosophy taught by US "The ideology--'Kawaida'--is divided into seven parts. It starts with mythology (religious views), history ('we need to write a new history'), social organization ('establishing roles') and economic organization. Of the economic attempt to gain resources, Karenga said 'of course not' to capitalism and that communism is 'anti-spiritual.' 'But,' he adds, 'we were communalists before Marx.'"[28]

Sex:

Both the Nazis and the New Left identified traditional sexual relationships as basic to the existence of the "old order." While using some of the old value terms, such as "love," both movements re-defined these concepts to mean promiscuity or so-called sexual equality and freedom.[29] Hearing old value-terms, but at the same time discovering that new meanings have been attached to them, is one of the reasons for feelings of insecurity among those who are not part of a revolutionary movement.

History:

Considering the basic nature of the Nazi- and New Left-approach it is little wonder that historical events had to be reinterpreted or changed, to bring them in line with idealized versions of what supposedly had "really happened." Two examples stand here for many. The first is a statement by Sylvester Leaks of the Harlem Writers Guild: "Slavery wasn't ended by white armies from the North...The Negroes of the South ended their own slavery."[30] Hitler tried to solve some of his historical problems when he stated: "With that we National Socialists draw consciously a line under the direction of the foreign policy of the time before the war. We start, where one stopped six centuries ago. We stop the eternal Germanic movement to the South and West of Europe and direct our eyes to the land in the East."[31] Again the impact of emotional needs, so vital to any romantic viewpoint, rather than strict adherence to historic fact, was a primary factor in these arguments.

The Cause:

Because of a newly defined moral base for action, complete identification with the goals of the extreme New Left or the Nazis, was a necessity to which individual concepts had to be subordinated. In the case of both the Nazis and the Extreme Left, "individual expression" or "initiative" come to mean conformity to a new morality because of its supposedly greater value. "Cleaver told the students that we have to make a distinction between who is the enemy and who isn't. He asked the students who were 'not the enemy' to join him in a song, which he said that he made up, called 'Fuck Ronald Reagan.' A thousand or more students joined in the chant which simply repeated the 'song' title several times."[32] Rhythm and emotional shock

were used in this case to suppress and supplant critical thought, while developing unified action.

Hitler firmly established the line that had to be followed by those who wanted to find themselves on the Fuehrer's side: "I have only had success...because I never allowed weaklings to talk me out of or remove me from an insight once given me...and because I was always decided to obey a once recognized necessity under all circumstances."[33] Hitler was fond of pointing out that all Germans were National Socialists by definition, only idiots were not, solving the "problem" of any possible disagreement.

Romantic notions should not be interpreted as signs of weakness, however. Extremists of the New Left were just as serious about their aims as were the Nazis. That could be seen by anyone who attended guerilla-warfare courses conducted as part of the curriculum at so-called Free-Universities or-Colleges, or by anyone who read handbills distributed on university campuses which instructed students in the construction of Molotov cocktails and bombs.

One point in which National Socialist- and the New Left-movements in America were very similar was the indefiniteness of their plans. When some of his party's theoreticians developed a 25-point program for his movement, Hitler responded negatively, and a definite "party-program" was never again developed as a guideline.[34] Compare to that the reaction by some who tried to find some definite plan behind New Left actions. "Unfortunately, Cleaver failed to present any really new concepts in his speech; neither did he succeed in providing new insights into old problems. Cleaver confined himself to generalities and never once outlined a specific proposal."[35] An article by George F. Kennan, entitled "The Student Left-Rebels Without a Program," which was reprinted in Reader's Digest,

was one of many similar contemporary expressions of confusion about the real purposes behind the rebellion of the New Left in America.[36]

THE RHETORICAL STRATEGIES OF THE TWO MOVEMENTS

With few specific action-programs to offer, while facing a nation which was confused about its purposes, goals, and values, a nation which sensed a need for change but was not certain in which direction to move, both America's New Left of the 1960's and Germany's National Socialists of the 1920's needed to secure followers and encourage people to accept their leadership.

Simplicity:

Hitler probably defined the standpoint of the romantic leader most adequately as he used the almost overwhelming appeal of simplicity before a people frightened by the complexity of their difficulties: "Our problems appear complicated. I on the other hand have simplified the problems and brought them down to the simplest formula."[37] No wonder that the hero figure is so important to any romantic movement, since it embodies these simplified answers and gives people a specific reference point. Bill Stanton, a former California state legislator, representing the teacher's union at San Francisco State College, explained how he saw the political situation facing him: "For Stanton, 'life is simple: there are good guys and bad guys.' At the base are the rich businessmen who, according to Stanton, hate students because 'they are young and have a fantastic sex life.'"[38] The frequent use of youth and sex by America's New Left as well as the Nazis, as romantic symbols to simplify certain complex difficulties, has been previously mentioned.

Faith:

Herbert Aptheker also used the rhetorical device of simplification when he defined the "real issues" facing America: "The real issues, to Professor Kahler, are the clear evidences of the vitiation and ossification of democratic government in the United States."[39] Even if these terms are not understood by listeners they form the basis for action, because of their relationship to the leaders who appear ready to conquer whatever they have identified. Hitler realized that, and in the frequently spiritual or pseudo-religious style of his romantic leadership asserted: "I once went out on the basis of faith in the German people and began this immeasurable struggle. On the basis of faith in me first thousands, then hundreds of thousands, and finally millions followed me."[40] The German "Fuehrer" clearly defined in this statement the success of the romantic leader's crusade. No wonder that American radicals of the New Left frequently made assertions based more on faith than reality: "The mind of our country is changing. Apathy is fading, fear is decreasing, commitment is growing. There is a world of work before us, but never has there been more reason for confidence - the radical's distinguishing feature."[41]

Action:

Calls for faith, requiring almost a blind faith of any given audience, are usually followed by calls for immediate and powerful action to prevent dissipation of the original high emotional pitch created in public speeches. Consider for instance the following statement from the Black Panther newspaper: "1968--the year of the pig. The death of the ballot, and the birth of the bullet--here is the choice, contemptuously thrust in our face

by this decadent racist power structure, racist pig Humphrey, racist pig Nixon, racist pig Wallace for President! So where do we go from here? Into the streets! Into the alleys."[42] The use of parallelisms and emotionally charged words leads readers swiftly to action, which does not provide a pragmatic or functional answer to the problem, but tends at least to solve the emotional difficulties of the "true believer."

Hitler whipped his masses into action by using the somewhat more moderate language of his days, which nevertheless was just as indefinite and just as clearly directed towards the underlying value systems of his listeners: "Men of the National Socialist movement: I require nothing illegal of you, demand nothing that would bring your conscience in conflict with the law, demand, however, that you follow me on the road which the law allows me, and which my conscience and my insight prescribe, in complete dedication, and that you unite your fate with mine."[43] Representatives of both America's New Left and National Socialism repeatedly referred to the higher laws, those values which supposedly were violated by existing establishments or the "System" of Hitler's days. Thus it is always intimated that "right" is on the side of the revolutionary because his struggle is against oppression. If one can link the values of the people addressed and the proposed course of action this call will become even more effective, as Hitler knew: "God has formed this nation; according to His will it became a reality; and according to our will it will remain evermore, and will nevermore disappear."[44] The use of hyperbole, absolutes, and spiritual values, common to traditional romantic language is apparent.

Power:

Dedication in and of itself, dedication to almost anything, can be a vital part of persuasive rhetorical appeals. Victory results, in the mind of the romantic, from such dedication: "I believe in higher justice, I believe that it defeated Germany because we had lost dedication, and I believe that it will help us because we confess dedication again."[45] What easier way is there to ignore all existing facts, what easier way to convince people who desperately need to win some sort of "victory" over themselves, their enemies, or severe problems? There is little difference between Hitler's mythical rhetorical approach to the relationship between the power he saw in the German people and their dedication, and, for instance, Cleaver's call for "...all power to the people. Black power for the black people. Red power for the red people. Yellow power for the yellow people, and white power for the white people."[46] Little wonder that in both cases, opposition leaders who tried to understand what Hitler meant and what Cleaver meant by this "power" they saw within their people, were confused, afraid, and ineffective in their attempts to deal with the concept. Depending on specific circumstances these terms could be re-evaluated, re-defined, and used once more to fulfill their primary function, that of making people "feel good" and ready to move into action. In addition, followers only needed faith in their leaders. As a result even though the leader could not define the specific actions he would eventually take, he was virtually forced by this approach to engage in some action, as Hitler summed it up: "May no one doubt my determination to also realize plans once made, one way or another."[47]

Unity:

One other vital concept shows the similarity of the romantic faith-structure in the communications of both America's New Left and Nazi Germany. That concept is the belief that unity, real or imagined, will bring about truly significant results. Hitler said: "As long as the German nation in its history was united it has never been conquered."[48] The Third World Liberation Front in the United States based its hopes on a similar answer: "When we unite this campus, faculty and students, to the understanding of how racist it is, and commit the campus to fighting racism, then the fight will be for home rule, what we call self-determination."[49]

Differences between National Socialism and America's New Left may have been the result of Communist doctrines relating to an evolutionary development which was supposed to lead to the eventual end of all organized government. Thus the New Left was more consistent in looking at its idealized revolution than were the Nazis. Consider the following statement: "In this country--getting back here to North America now--we can side with the student radicals. We would try to encourage them and persuade them to organize and weld a sharp cutting tool. In order to do this they would have to be disciplined and they should have at least some philosophical replacement of the system. This is not to say that this itself will free the individual. The individual will not be free until the state does not exist at all and I think--I don't want to be redundant--this cannot be replaced by the anarchists right away."[50]

Perhaps this is a brief glance behind the facade of the romantic leader. He has to convince the anarchistic, idealistic follower desirous of destroying all forms of an establishment, that those who wish to lead him have the same purpose in mind. Many leaders, however, trust the

masses as little as they trust a totally unstructured society in spite of their own romanticized revolutionary statements. After all, the immediate purpose of such leaders is usually to develop their own organized form of government. The following statement illustrates that idea: "...they (anarchists) shouldn't be advanced higher because they should see the necessity of wiping out imperalistic structure by organized groups just as we must be organized...I can imagine in the future that the blacks will rebel gainst the organized leadership that the blacks themselves have structured."[51]

Hitler eventually had to face his own cohorts as they continued a revolution which became dangerous to the aims of their former leader, forcing Hitler to kill some of his closest friends or lose power. Revolutionary leaders of the New Left increasingly faced opposition and rebellion in the ranks of their own organizations.

The Common Enemy:

One final rhetorical device to be mentioned here is the highly personalized form of attack on those individuals and groups who are identified in some way as the sources of the people's problems. For Hitler much of the guilt was assigned to the Jews, and using the prevailing values of his day he said: "In defending myself against the Jew, I am fulfilling the work of the Lord."[52] Where Hitler's party paper Der Stuermer would feature Jews, "plutocrats," and monarchists with pigsheads, Cleaver and others referred to representatives of the establishment, whether they were policemen or presidents as "pigs." The members of the political opposition were not as fequently attacked by Hitler through the use of four-letter words, but his open threats were just as frighten-

ing and intended to shock as those used by the New Left: "What General Groener, Herr Braun, Herr Severing, Herr Stuetzel, Herr Bruening, etc., want, I know, and you know it too. Our answer to this new stroke of desperation by the establishment is not going to be a parade, but a blow."[53] Just as clearly identified with the value systems of their audience, radicals of the 60's worked on the emotions of their followers in a very similar fashion. "WANTED: Sam I. Hayakawa. ALIASES: Paper Puppet, Bootlicker, Ruling Class Lackey, Flower Child. HE HAS BEEN INDICTED BY THE PEOPLE FOR: Enforcing racist policies of the Board of Trustees of San Francisco State College and sending armed thugs to attack, brutalize and maim students, black and third world people fighting for their just demands...EMPLOYMENT: Professionally has been and still is vocal official of the policies of the corporate class, has recently been elevated to the job of Acting President of S.F. State. In this position he is officially serving as apple polishing, ass kissing lackey for the corporate power structure which controls the State College system...Only the power of the United People will be able to apprehend this Felon and Destroy his bosses, the Bandit Trustees and Henchman Politicians."[54]

SUMMARY:

In the preceding pages it has been indicated that both National Socialism and America's New Left are similar in their development as neo-romantic movements. Both in the use of verbal and non-verbal supportive devices the rhetorical critic can demonstrate the relationship of National Socialism's approach to the problems of its days and

the approaches of America's New Left. Lack of functional symbols and the inability to keep highly emotional romantic concepts alive in the face of an increasing necessity for solving existing problems, leads eventually to the development of other forces, or the success of those forces whose world view is considerably less romantic but whose programs provide answers which the majority of the people seek.

As Germany's economic and political problems diminished, Hitler's chances for a revolutionary take-over decreased. The only compromise the Fuehrer was willing to make to achieve his ultimate aim of power was a take-over by what he called "constitutional means." Unfortunately, for the German people, that bit of pragmatic adjustment did not influence his twisted, distorted, romanticized notions of the world and the people in it. The results are a tragic part of history.

FOOTNOTES

All material relating to Hitler's speeches, and other documents related to the German Fuehrer used in this paper, have been translated by the writer from one of the most extensive German-language sources of documents compiled by Max Domarus.

Max Domarus, Hitler, 2 vols. (Muenchen, 1965)

[1]See: Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf (Muenchen, 1933). Henry Picker, Hitler's Tischgespraeche (Bonn, 1951).

[2]See: Konrad Heiden, Der Fuehrer (Boston, 1944).

[3]Alan Bullock, Hitler, Study in Tyranny (New York, 1962), pp. 66, 67.

[4]Bullock, pp. 74, 75.

[5]Bullock, pp. 74, 75.

[6]Bullock, pp. 135-137, 168, 284-307.

[7]Bullock, pp. 643-645.

[8]For a complete account see: Hans Royce, editor, 20 Juli 1944 (Bonn, 1961).

[9]Consider the following authors who have discussed various romantic aspects of the Nazi movement.

Karl Kindt, Der Fuehrer als Redner (Hamburg, 1933).

Emil Dovifat, Rede und Redner; Ihr Wesen und Ihre Politische Macht (Leipzig, 1937).

Joseph Tenenbaum, Race and Reich (New York, 1956).

Hans Kohn, The Mind of Germany (New York, 1960).

William Ebenstein, The Nazi State (New York, 1943).

Emil Ludwig, The Germans (Boston, 1941).

Hans Buchheim, Der Fuehrer ins Nichts (Rastatt, 1960).

Hans Kohn, Revolutions and Dictatorships (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1943).

[10]For a generally recognized source on romantic movements, especially in literature see: Ernest Bernbaum, Guide through the Romantic Movement (New York, 1949), especially chapter 20.

[11]Mario Praz, The Romantic Agony (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1963), p. 14.

[12]Praz, p. 15.

[13]Ibid.

[14]C.M. Bowra, The Romantic Imagination (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 4.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Bowra, p. 7.

[18]Henry Picker, Hitler's Tischgespraeche (Bonn, 1951).

[19]Domarus, p. 62. January 1, 1932.

[20]People's World, XXXI (January 11, 1969), 2.

[21]UCLA Daily Bruin, LSSV, No. 7 (October 7, 1968), 1.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Domarus, pp. 87-88.

[25]The Black Panther (October 5, 1968), 11.

[26]Afro-American Revolt, V, No. 4 (May-June, 1964), front page.

[27]The Black Panther (October 5, 1968), 4.

[28]UCLA Daily Bruin, LXXXVI, No. 21 (February 3, 1969), 1.

[29]The strong emphasis on bearing children "for the state" can be found, for instance, in: Adolf Hitler, Worte des Fuehrers an die deutschen Frauen (Leipzig, 1935).

[30]Alice Widener, "Student Supervision" reprints of articles originally published in USA (New York, 1968), p. 6.

[31]Hitler, Mein Kampf, p. 742.

[32]UCLA Daily Bruin, LXXV, No. 7 (October 7, 1968), 1.

[33]Domarus, p. 646.

[34]Hitler, Mein Kampf, pp. 513-514.

[35]UCLA Daily Bruin, LXXV, No. 7 (October 7, 1968), 4.

[36]George F. Kennan, "The Student Left-Rebels Without a Program," Reader's Digest, reprint of a January, 1969, article.

[37]Domarus, p. 580.

[38]"S.F. Strike Objectives Explained by Participants," Triton Times, University of California, San Diego, VI, No. 3 (January 31, 1969), 1.

[39]Herbert Aptheker, Political Affairs (December, 1963), 41.

[40]Domarus, p. 837. March 25, 1938.

[41]Aptheker, p. 40.

[42]The Black Panther (October 5, 1968), 2.

[43]Domarus, p. 62. January 1, 1932.

[44]Domarus, p. 712.

[45]Domarus, p. 95.

[46]UCLA Daily Bruin, LXXV, No. 7 (October 7, 1968), 1.

[47]Domarus, p. 681.

[48]Domarus, p. 1341.

[49]People's World, XXXI (January 11, 1969), 2.

[50]Huey Newton, People's World, reprinted from The Black Panther.

[51]People's World, XXX (December 7, 1968), 9.

[52]Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf (Muenchen, 1933), p. 70.

[53]Domarus, p. 105. April 13, 1932.

[54]Triton Times, VI, No. 2 (January 24, 1969), 2.